

Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science

Minutes of the meeting held on May 2, 1986

Present: C.L. Bertrand, Chairperson; D. Dicks; P. Albert; F. Shlosser; G. Valaskakis; J. Princz; C. Foster; T. Arbuckle-Maag; V.V. Baba; M. Barlow; A. Broes; D. Brown; W. Byers; A. Costanzo; R. Cronin, s.j.; L. Crysler; J. Doyle; M. Doughty; W. Gilsdorf; R. Hooper; W. Knitter; J. Locke; D. Markiewicz; D. McDougall; J. Ryan; G. Newsham; M. Oppenheim; R. Pallen; B. Sahni; W. Sellers; D. Shapiro; R. Sharma; H. Shulman; G. Trudel; L. Van Toch; K. Waters; D. Goldsmith; L. Gray; D. Kahane; N. Wallace; H. Chorney (Political Science).

Guests: L. Sanders (Classics)

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:40 a.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

86-4-1 The agenda was approved as distributed (Goldsmith/Brown).

Carried

Closed Session

[REDACTED]

Open Session

4. Approval of Minutes

86-4-3 It was moved and seconded (Trudel/Goldsmith) to approve the minutes of the meeting held on April 4, 1986.

Vote: Carried

5. Chairperson's Remarks

Dean Bertrand said that he wanted to congratulate publicly, in Council the Chairpersons of Departments, Principals, and Directors for their excellent work all year in cooperating with the Vice-Deans and himself on a variety of levels. He referred to the major upheaval over the summer caused by reorganization of the Faculty which was not easy on anybody but was made much easier on his Office through the cooperation of the Chairpersons. He commended the faculty and students who had cooperated to make the first year manageable. The Dean reported that it is likely that a balanced budget will be achieved for this year which he considered a tremendous achievement and which, without the cooperation of the people involved could not have happened. He thanked all most sincerely.

6. Questions and Announcements

Concern was expressed over the way the Arts and Science Graduation ceremonies have been split (A-L and M-Z) causing consternation among students. It was asked if changes might be considered particularly in the matter of keeping departments whole.

The Dean replied that he did not want to split the ceremonies into Arts and Science and that this seemed the simplest solution and would also encourage faculty to attend both sessions. He noted that for the first time the Chairpersons of departments will be allowed to give out departmental prizes to the students. He said that he would be willing to consider a division by departments for next year but could not make a change in the current plans. He suggested that departments might consider having small receptions for their graduates following the ceremonies.

It was asked if it would not be possible to allow more than 24 hours between the last lecture and the first examination in a course, and to reinstate the make-up days in the second term. The Dean requested that Vice-Dean Shlosser bring the matter to the Registrar's attention. She was asked, also, to look into the scheduling of examinations.

Dean Bertrand was asked if he would present a statement to Council at the next meeting concerning the budget for next year.

The problem of numerical versus letter grades was brought up. The official grades are the letter grades. In order to prevent constant recalculation by students, faculty must clearly state how components of courses will be marked in order to arrive at a final grade. It was noted that UCCC was about to propose changes be made to the UG Calendar which would make it clear that only letter grades would be considered official.

7. Elections (ASFC 86-4-D1)

The slate of nominations presented by Council by the Steering Committee was accepted (ASFC 86-4-D1).

The Chairperson called for nominations from the floor. Nominated were:

<u>Nominated</u>	<u>Committee</u>	<u>Nominated by:</u>
R. Cronin (Biology)	Com. to Supervise Elections	R. Cronin
W. Reimer (Socio/Anth)	Hum.Grad.Studies Com.	W. Knitter
M. Allor (Com.Studies)	Hum.Grad.Studies Com.	W. Gilsdorf
M. Brian (Mathematics)	A & S Com. on Status of Women	K. Waters
M. Taylor (App.Soc.Sc.)	A & S Com. on Status of Women	W. Gilsdorf
P. Seraganian (Psych)	Senate	(Omitted from original list)
B. Slack (Geography)	Senate	R. Cronin
J. Lightstone (Religion)	Senate	M. Oppenheim
R. Martin (English)	Aca. Planning and Priorities Com. of Senate	K. Waters

Dean Bertrand reported that he had had a request (ASFC 86-4-D12 uncirculated) from a Council member that for the election of the Senators and the election to the three Senate committees; Academic Planning, Academic Programmes, Research Committee, the vote required be 50% or more for each of the people elected. He left the decision up to the members of Council. It was decided that the 50% minimum vote would apply to the elections for members to the sub-committees.

Prof. Albert, Dicks and Oppenheim acted as scrutineers for the elections.

The election results follow:

A. Arts and Science Committee to Supervise Elections (One year terms)

S.J. Sullivan	Exercise Science	Acclaimed
V. McNamara	Philosophy	Acclaimed
R. Cronin	Biology	Acclaimed

B. Arts and Science Curriculum Committee

M. Foster (2 year term)	English	Elected
G. Newsham (2 year term)	TESL	Elected
P. d'Hollander (1 year term)	Etudes Franc.	Elected



C. Committee of General Education

L. Nowicki	English	Acclaimed
------------	---------	-----------

The election for the two remaining positions will take place at the next meeting of Faculty Council.

D. Faculty Honours Committee (Two year terms)

J. Lightstone	Religion	Acclaimed
N. Taylor	Psychology	Acclaimed

E. Student Request Committee

W. Sellers (Two year term)	Exercise Science	Acclaimed
G. Adams (Two year term)	History	Acclaimed
L. VanToch (One year term)	Etudes Franc.	Elected

F. Humanities Graduate Studies Committee

R. Belkin	English	Elected
G. Adams	History	Elected
M. Despland	Religion	Elected
M. Allor	Com. Studies	Elected

G. Board of Graduate Studies

(Three year terms)

M. Oppenheim	Religion	Acclaimed
R. Tittler	History	Acclaimed
S. Misra	Physics	Acclaimed
P. Morley	English	Acclaimed

(Two year term)

N. Herscovitz	Mathematics	Acclaimed
---------------	-------------	-----------

The election for the sixth position, for a one-year term, will take place at the next meeting.

H. Graduate Awards Committee (Two year terms)

R. Philmus	English	Acclaimed
L. Sanders	Classics	Acclaimed

I. Arts and Science Faculty Committee on the Status of Women (one year terms)

S. Mullett	Philosophy	Elected
W. Gilsdorf	Com. Studies	Elected
M. Brian	Mathematics	Elected

J. Senate

(Three year terms)

B. Slack	Geography	Elected
H. Shulman	Political Science	Elected
G. Valaskakis	Com. Studies	Elected

(Two year terms)

D. Dicks	Education	Elected
W. Knitter	Education	Elected
J. Ryan	Theological Studies	Elected

(One year terms)

M. Foster	English	Elected
P. Seraganian	Psychology	Elected
J. Lightstone	Religion	Elected

K. Academic Planning and Priorities Committee of Senate

R. Martin	English	Elected
-----------	---------	---------

L. Academic Programmes Committee

J. Drysdale	Socio & Anthro..	Acclaimed
-------------	------------------	-----------

M. Research Committee

P. Shizgal	Psychology	Elected
------------	------------	---------

N. Academic Services Committee

86-4-4

It was moved and seconded (Waters/Gilsdorf) to table the election to the next meeting of Council.

O. Senate Library Committee

R. Diubaldo	History	Acclaimed
M. Barlow	Geography	Acclaimed
M. Baldwin	Chemistry	Acclaimed
		(Resigned)

P. Fellowships, Scholarships and Awards Committee

M. Doughty	Chemistry	Acclaimed
------------	-----------	-----------

Q. Computer Science Sub-committee

Election delayed until fall (Senate must approve UCCG's proposals to restructure certain committees).

R. Sub-committee on the University Writing Test

H. Hill	English Dept. Rep.	Acclaimed
D. Levy	Etudes Françaises Rep.	Acclaimed
M. Entwistle	Education Dept. Rep.	Acclaimed
B. Barkman	TESL Rep.	Acclaimed

8. Curriculum Committee Reports

D. Dicks thanked the Curriculum Committee and C. Brown (secretary) for their work in handling enormous amounts of material.

a) Ph.D. Religion/Religious Studies (ASFC 86-4-D4)

Vice-Dean Dicks explained that this was the calendar entry for a joint programme between Concordia and UQAM.

Prof. Costanzo wondered whether our Theological Studies Department entered into this. Prof. Oppenheim replied that Theological Studies has not had a Ph.D. programme approved by Quebec and therefore is not a part of this co-operative venture. Prof. Ryan stated that although Theological Studies is a member of the graduate faculty in Religion, his department had no particular competence in the field in which the programme was to be structured.

Prof. Costanzo suggested that non-Canadian students would not have the working knowledge of either French or English that the programme required. In reply, it was noted that this was not a change in the programme, that non-Canadians must have English (at least) and that, in any case, they could cope since seminars were given in English or French in alternate years.

Prof. Brown asked how a Ph.D. could be given without requiring Hebrew, Greek or Latin. Vice-Dean Dicks said this was covered by point 7 which states that a student is expected to have a command of languages in the primary sources required for the thesis.

86-4-5 It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Oppenheim) to approve the calendar entry pertaining to the Ph.D. Religion/Religious Studies (ASFC 86-4-D4).

Vote: Carried, 1 abstention

b) Undergraduate Curriculum Course changes 1987-88 - Report 51U - New Programmes Only (ASFC 86-4-D2)

(1) Chemistry: B.Sc. Specialization in Synthetic Materials

86-4-6 It was moved and seconded to approve the new programme proposal in Chemistry (Dicks/Doughty).

Vote: Carried



(ii) English: Joint Specialization in Playwriting (English and Theatre)

It was asked why this was a joint specialization rather than a double major. Prof. Waters replied that this programme is 60 credits, thus fulfilling the requirement of a specialization over two disciplines. Also, this programme would look strong on a student record. She stated her pleasure that the initiative for this programme came from Theatre. Prof. Crysler in support, noted that double majors do only 42 credits, that is, they do only 6 credits in other courses in the university and thus do not get the broader perspective.

86-4-7 It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Broes) to approve the new Joint Specialization in Playwriting (English and Theatre).

Vote: Carried

(iii) Sociology and Anthropology: B.A. Specialization in Anthropology

86-4-8 It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Pallen) to approve the B.A. Specialization in Anthropology.

Vote: Carried

(iv) TESL: B.Ed. Honours in Teaching of English as a Second Language

A correction was noted on page 1 of Report 51U. The number of credits in the description is not 48 but 78.

Prof. Byers wondered if it were normal for an Honours Programme and a Specialization to be identical except for the grade point requirement.

Prof. Broes said there was greater flexibility in terms of requirement. In the Specialization in English, there was no thesis or special seminar.

Vice-Dean Valaskakis thought that confusion existed between graduating from an honours programme and graduating with honours. She said it was difficult for the French systems to understand that we have Specializations as well as Honours; however, specific needs are met by each programme.

Vice-Dean Shlosser said that the Specialization should be seen as a programme and a structure not necessarily having anything to do with brilliant grades. Students in a Specialization, may even have higher grades than those in Honours.

Prof. Pallen said that other universities recognize Honours as an entrance requirement to a graduate programme; thus some part of the programme should give the student training in research. He thought it might be a good idea to upgrade Honours programmes rather than to advertise the programmes having this requirement. He thought the TESL description should include a statement to the effect that this would prepare students for graduate work.

Professors Byers and Crysler were in favour of honours programmes with distinctive features, even if this meant a difference in one course only. Prof. Broes also agreed with differentiation beyond the GPA, noting that English tried to differentiate their programmes in the past year with the introduction of a seminar requirement in the Honours programme.

Prof. Costanzo queried the acceptability of the 78 credits leaving only 12 to be completed outside the department. The programme seemed too specialized. Vice-Dean Dicks replied that this ruling was not under our control and affected a number of programmes in the sciences, education and psychology.

Vice-Dean Dicks thought that Council could approve TESL's proposal in principle, but subject to a modification that an honours thesis or seminar be introduced. Dean Bertrand added that another approach would be to table the matter until September.

86-4-9

It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Arbuckle-Maag) to table the B.Ed. Honours in the Teaching of English as a Second Language.

Vote: Carried, 1 opposed

c) Undergraduate Curriculum Course Changes 1987-88 - Report 52U  
(ASFC 86-4-D3)

University Writing Test (UWT):

The UWT Committee recommends a change in the way the UWT operates. Students would now be compelled to sit the test immediately after admission. The university would then know which students have passed the graduation requirement and which needed remedial help. This system would benefit those who repeatedly fail and reduce appeals and problems at the point of graduation.

Vice-Dean Shlosser wished to change the sentence "students scoring below 5 are required to register for remedial courses..." She indicated that a better wording would include "they must pass". As it stands, students might register and then drop the course. We would have no control over this.

Vice-Dean Dicks stated that the purpose of the change was to make students aware early on that they must pass the UWT in order to avoid later complications. A failure means the test must be re-taken and could indeed delay graduation. He noted that under the present agreement we do not keep pass/fail records in a formal sense. The only notation on the transcript is that they have met the requirement.

86-4-10

It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Waters) that the changes to the operation of the UWT be accepted.

Vote: Carried



86-4-11 For expediency, Vice-Dean Dicks moved, and Prof. Oppenheim seconded, acceptance of the items on pages 2-57 of Report 52U (ASFC 86-4-D3) dealing with Undergraduate Curriculum Course Changes 1987-88. It was noted that Prof. Dicks was to signal the major changes and that 1 vote would be taken after discussion, which would follow the order of the document.

Applied Social Science: Minor

Biology: Minor & Major

When asked to explain the C-rule, Vice-Dean Dicks invited Council to read the "Short Rationale" on page 4. The change suggests that any course in Biology which is a pre-requisite for a subsequent course, should be passed at the "C" level. Dr. Dicks noted that this practice exists "formally/informally" everywhere. He said there were administrative arguments against the change as well as complaints that the change would raise the pass level from "D" to "C". As to the latter, he felt that we already had pass levels ranging from "D- to A+".

Prof. Dicks said that UCCC's alternative was to change the description of the "D" grade throughout the university rather than to implement a G-rule for Biology. UCCC felt something like "Pass, but not adequate for pre-registration purposes", would simplify matters.

Prof. Pallen suggested that since the C-rule exists in a number of departments, Council could pass it; if a somewhat grander motion were in order, that could come up at a future meeting.

Prof. Byers expressed sympathy for the request as C-level means anything within the "C" rating.

Prof. Doyle asked how clear this would be to a Biology student. He said that this was applying a quality mark control, something that has previously applied only to Honours programmes. He had no objection to the rule but noted that after obtaining a "D", the student was out of the programme.

Vice-Dean Dicks disagreed, saying that the student had alternatives and would, of course, not be able to take the courses that required the pre-requisite in which he had not obtained a "C"; however, he would be able to follow programmes.

Prof. Doyle asked how the student could advance. Prof. Dicks replied that the student would have to change his curriculum and choose another stream within Biology, for example, genetics or ecology.

Prof. Dicks, in reply to Prof. Shulman, confirmed that a student obtaining a "D" could re-take the course and use this as a means to raise the grade.

Chemistry: Minor

Education: Minor

English: Minor

Prof. Broes noted on page 13 - under Modern British, European and Anglo-Irish - that ENGL 354 was being re-numbered to 355 as per the explanation on page 15.

He also thought that ENGL 364 (Contemporary American Fiction) had been omitted and should be offered along with ENGL 363 (Modern American Fiction). Prof. Waters replied that this was not the case. The purpose of the category was to keep the courses largely modernist. Contemporary was deliberately omitted in order to force students to take courses focusing on the first half of the 20th C.

French: Major

Vice-Dean Dicks explained that Council had before it the consolidation of 6 programmes into 3. Some changes were a collapsing of sub-specializations in Quebec Literature into French Literature. Other significant changes split the Translation Programme into two components, French to English and English to French. He invited Council to read the rational on page 28.

Exercise Science: Minor

Prof. B. Petrie noted that the course EXCI 221(3) - "Statistical Procedures in Exercise Science" (page 42) seemed to be a very basic statistics course and wondered if students could perhaps take it under another number.

Vice-Dean Dicks explained that Exercise Science students had been able to take BIOL 222 before this was moved to the 300 level with pre-requisites being added. This course, sometimes given by Mathematics Faculty, was subsequently moved into Exercise Science. Prof. Dicks indicated that the course was sufficiently different and that he saw no problem with it.

History: Minor

Library Studies: Minor

Math: Minor

Physics: Minor

Unfortunately, no member from Physics was present when discussion on the modification to the B.Sc. Specialization in Physics/Marketing (page 51) took place.

It was asked how the 90-credit specialization in rather distinct fields had come about, and why it was structured in this fashion, rather than allowing a double major or specialization in a minor.

Prof. Broes noted that this Specialization does not allow students to take more credits outside the area than a double major would. Prof. Pallen replied that students do, in fact, get outside viewpoints; he noted the courses that must be taken in Mathematics, Physics and Computer Science.

Prof. B. Petrie recalled that Council had specified, after lengthy debate, that a student must be allowed some free choice. He noted that the choice here was very structure and that it must be in Marketing.

Prof. Pallen noted that programmes of the Physics Department were recently evaluated in light of the Task Force on Curriculum and he felt that all courses had been approved at that time.

Vice-Dean Dicks said the issue here was only to change numbers on an old course, not to introduce a new one.

Prof. Arbuckle-Maag said that the programme conforms correctly to the many hours of debate. The Cohen Report referred to credits within a discipline, and not to programmes. Students in a Specialization are not required to take "not more than 60 credits in any one discipline". Students do have a free choice if it suits their need and there are advantages where all 90 credits are more or less specialized.

Prof. Ryan, in response, said that the debate had concerned general education within the Faculty of Arts & Science. A situation was desired where students would take credits outside their discipline but within Arts & Science. Prof. Ryan, wondering why the programme was called a Specialization described the programme as essentially two majors and a specialization in neither or, as a specialization in a combination of two diversified subjects.

Prof. Pallen, as a point of information, noted that the proposal asked for changes in numbering, not for acceptance of a new programme which was already approved. He thought that this discussion could be held for the future.

Dean Bertrand suggested that Council could pass an amendment to the motion on the floor to return the item to Physics with the concerns noted by Council regarding the lack of free credits. Physics could bring the matter to Council again in September.



Prof. Waters wondered if it would be appropriate to question the title. She suggested that Joint Specialization might be better for it would bring up the possibility of a joint seminar or joint course at a future date. Vice-Dean Dicks agreed to bring this concern to the attention of the Physics Department.

- 86-4-12 It was moved and seconded (Oppenheim/Goldsmith) that an amendment on the motion to approve the changes to the B.Sc. Specialization in Physics/Marketing be passed as Council wishes to know why there is no possibility of free electives within this Specialization.

Vote: Carried

Prof. Doyle felt that Council could profitably review the definition of Specialization. He felt the distinction was not merely one of credits.

Dean Bertrand quoted: "The Specialization, in keeping with the structures recommended by the Quebec Council of Universities, is an approved sequence of courses totalling 60 or more credits. In very exceptional cases there may be a performance requirement." (p. 52 UG Calendar).

Political Science: Major

Prof. Barlow asked whether POLI 385(3) - Environmental Issues and Policy (page 53) - overlapped with Science & Human Affairs. Prof. Chorney replied that since the topic can be highly political, the need for political theory was deemed necessary. The viewpoint differed and did not constitute an overlap.

Prof. Broes thought the course might be better as a slot course. He also thought the sentence in parenthesis should be deleted. Prof. Chorney agreed, saying the phrase was probably part of the rationale.

Prof. Waters wondered if there were resource implications with POLI 275(3) - Women and Politics. Vice-Dean Dicks replied that there were none.

- 86-4-13 It was moved and seconded (Pallen/Crysler) that POLI 385 - Environmental Issues and Policy - be tabled until the Curriculum Committee can satisfy itself that this is not just a proliferation of courses because these types of courses are given in Chemistry, Science & Human Affairs and in Engineering.

Vote: Carried

- 86-4-14 An amendment to delete the parenthetical phrase in the course description for POLI 389 was moved and seconded (Broes/Gilsdorf).

Vote: Carried

Psychology: Minor

SCPA: Major and Minor

Science College: Minor

86-4-15 The Dean called for a vote on the curriculum changes as amended.

Vote: Carried

Vice-Dean Dicks stated that he would like to enter in the record, in order to facilitate the work of the Vice-Deans and to alert the advisors that these rules exist, the listing of the special cases within the Faculty in terms of the normal 24-credit rule.

Prof. Arbuckle-Maag proceeded to list the corrections. (Please see below: ASFC 86-4-D8, amended, May 8/86).

List 1

Chemistry	Spec. in Biochemistry	69	15 Biol.
	Spec. in Anal. Chem.	63	4 Phys
Classics	Hons. Class. Philology	66	18 Latin, 18 Greek
Geology	Hons. Geology	69	3 Comp. Sc.
Psychology	Hons. B.A.	66	
	Hons. B.Sc.	66	-- plus at least 15 Science

List 2

Biology	Hons.	72	9 Chem.
Early Child- hood Educ.	Spec. in E.C.E.	78	6 Fine Arts or EXCI
Physics	Hons.	72	6 MATH
TESL	B.Ed. (TESL)	90	30 from EDUC, PSYC or ENGL 12 electives

9. Motion from Prof. D. Brown concerning the Department of Classics  
(ASFC 86-4-D5)

86-4-16 It was moved and seconded (Brown/Ryan) that the motion regarding the Classics Department (ASFC 86-4-D5) be accepted.

Prof. Brown presented the motion, and explained that Classics had had the equivalent of 6 or 7 FT faculty, but that the failure to replace retirements, the pending retirement of one person this spring, and the leave of absence of another, would bring the FT roster to 2 if no replacements were authorized. Prof. Brown explained that Classics had a large number of students and was, to a great extent, a service department. He said that Classics needed a tenure-track replacement and that he hoped Council would recommend to Senate that a FT tenure-track position be authorized for September, assuming that Classics loses another member through early retirement. He said that the motion was concerned with the viability of the department which could not service approximately 1,000 students with only 2 FT faculty and that failure to replace faculty could only be seen as a move towards the dissolution of Classics.

Prof. Oppenheim, in giving Steering Committee's point of view, argued that Prof. Brown's motion be rejected. He presented a counter motion from Steering Committee (ASFC 86-4-D6). He said that Steering Committee viewed the issue as a personnel matter and had asked itself whether dissolution could come about if a faculty member were not replaced. Steering Committee felt that viability of the Department might be affected but said that this type of question was more properly directed to Senate (according to Article 44.03 of the Collective Agreement).

Prof. Pallen pointed out that the motion read by Prof. Brown says there is a deliberate move to dissolve the department. He thought the motion should go to Senate for a decision.

One member felt that Arts and Science could express an opinion to Senate but would need factual data beforehand. He felt that the Classics motion wished Council to express an opinion but instead actually asked something entirely different.

Prof. Crysler suggested that many units in Arts and Science had a low number of FT faculty; no one questioned their viability or suggested that they were not valuable.

Prof. Waters felt the solution was not necessarily a tenure-track position; the department might hire post-doctorals for a few years. She said she could support an expression of concern, rather than a demand for tenure-track position if it were to read, for example, "This Council is concerned that the number of faculty teaching in '86-'87 may be inadequate for the student enrolment in Classics".



Prof. Ryan stated that the Steering Committee's preamble to its motion was incorrect and misleading in stating that the present motion of Classics is outside the jurisdiction of Council. He said that although Senate must make the decision, Council has the prerogative of advising Senate.

It was noted that Article 44 does not say that the viability of a department is properly considered by Senate but speaks rather of "viability of the programme(s)/department as determined by Senate". Thus there is no implication that Steering Committee does not have the right to discuss, decide and inform Senate.

Prof. Ryan said that the motion asks for discussion of two matters. First, whether Classics is justified in claiming that failure to replace a returning member with a tenure track appointment seriously threatens its viability. Second, whether or not the Dean is mistaken in his understanding of the prerogatives of Council, of the Board of Governors and of CUFA as they relate to this matter, as revealed by statements made in communications to the department and by answers to questions asked at the previous Council meeting, April 4.

Prof. Ryan indicated, by citing extensively from the Minutes of April 4, points on which he had found the Dean to be incorrect. The Dean had said (p.2) that the closing of a programme had nothing to do with the Board of Governors. The Dean had said (p.5) that he had no intention of dissolving Classics, and then later (p.7) suggested that it might be absorbed into History or Modern Languages. The Dean denied (p.5) he had said that Council would have no say in determining whether viability was threatened by the reduction of faculty from 4 to 3, whereas the faculty of Classics agreed he had said this. The Dean did not think that Article 44.03 had anything to do with the problem at hand (p.7) whereas Steering Committee's motion declares him to be in error. Also, the Dean, as stated in The Link, had told Prof. Sanders that the matter of Classics was none of CUFA's business; the Dean had stated (before the UAB) that service to the community must not be considered when evaluating a faculty member's performance, and this was a violation of the Collective Agreement. Prof. Ryan noted that the C.V. Update form of Arts and Science makes no allowance for service to the community.

Prof. Ryan said the point being made was that the Dean apparently did not wish to have open discussion on the closing of departments or the folding-in of programmes into other departments but rather intended to do this apart from consultation and approval of the various faculty bodies. He said his concern was that Council was being contravened when it was not allowed to discuss, instruct, and inform Senate of its decision in this matter.

Prof. Broes felt that many of the problems brought forward by Prof. Brown were caused by a combination of personnel issues and had little to do with the absence of a tenure track appointment. He agreed with Prof. Waters' suggestion that a full-time appointment, not necessarily tenure track, might be beneficial at this point.

Prof. Brown declared his willingness to modify the motion.

Prof. Oppenheim wondered whether a number of Chairpersons pressured by replacement/retirement issues might now begin to view their staffing problems as a question of viability and bring their concerns before Council for a decision. He said that Steering Committee is not saying that the issue is or is not a matter of viability, but only that, according to the Collective Agreement, the issue should come before Senate.

Dean Bertrand gave Classics enrollment figures as of February 1986. Enrolled in Classics programmes: 46 FT students, 37 PT students. The number of students in all Classics courses: 462 (an average of 42 per class). Student credits (462 x 3): 1,386.

Prof. Shulman said that viability did not seem to be an issue Council could discuss. He thought the question being asked was whether or not there existed an implicit policy about the fostering of Classics' types of issues.

L. Gray stated that although death through attrition was a reality, his experience with the present administration did not lead him to believe this had been intended; the administration seemed favourable to small programmes. He appreciated the position of Classics and felt that there must be a forum for discussion, in this case, Senate, which did not, however, preclude Arts & Science giving an opinion on the matter. He also felt that a Chairperson's natural reaction would be to bring the matter before Council for endorsement.

L. Gray proposed an amendment to Prof. Brown's motion: "Be it resolved that Council will regard a failure to replace a retiring member of Classics with a full-time teaching position as a move undermining the ability of the Classics Department to carry out its teaching responsibility."

Dean Bertrand ruled the proposed amendment out of order as it changed the intent of the original motion.

Prof. Brown said he was delighted with the sympathy expressed for Classics. He said that Classics did intend to go to Senate as it could not take the risk that one of the pool positions might not be returned to the department. Prof. Brown added that Classics maintains that as a constituent academic department of Council which feels its viability and existence threatened, they have the right to bring this matter before Council. Classics is requesting that Council listen to its presentation of the facts and then decide to vote on a recommendation which will go to Senate for decision.

Prof. Gilsdorf felt that the motion presented by Classics prevented Council from looking at key issues. He found it was negatively stated and difficult to sort out the real issues and concerns. He did not wish Council to be pushed into making personnel decisions. He further



felt that the administration had a right to evaluate programmes and suggest some re-organization. He thought proper concerns would be, for example: Classics central to a concept of Arts & Science? What is the relationship between enrolment pressures and the viability of a programme? How many faculty are needed to keep a programme viable?

Prof. Shulman said that Classics should not base their arguments on enrollment. He believed low enrollment in Classics courses was immaterial for Classics is intrinsic and necessary to a university and an Arts and Science faculty. He felt that if the issue at hand was a problem of the viability of the discipline of Classics, then the university had a responsibility to do something to ensure its viability.

Prof. Shulman asked Dean Bertrand the following questions: 1) Have you been asked to consider the needs of Classics in terms of giving them a replacement position, sessional, one-year, or tenure track? 2) Have you been told that for 1986-87 the Classics Department has a special problem, and would you try to respond to it? 3) Have you made up your mind that you cannot do anything for another year at least because all the recommendations are made, whatever the nature of the appointment? 4) How open to some resolution are you at this stage?

Dean Bertrand replied that the issue is more complex than has been indicated here and that in many ways they may be debating a moot point since there are currently 4 FT members of Classics and it was not clear that this was going to change in the next year. When it looked as if it might change, he had suggested to the Classics Department that there were a number of ways the problem might be approached. One suggestion was that the department be housed elsewhere in order to eliminate the administrative pressures that exist for every department. This suggestion was seen by some as a move to dissolve the department.

Dean Bertrand said that he did not particularly wish to dissolve Classics. He agreed that there should be the presence of Classics programme within the Faculty, although he did not necessarily feel that this meant a department. He said that Classics was told that given the late date, the fact that funds for positions, including sessionals, have all been allocated, the fact that he and the Vice-Deans would meet 8 May to discuss the academic priorities of the Faculty and, given that no decisions would be made until the priorities have been set (Collective Agreement 44.01) he would be prepared to give the department part-time help for '86-'87. Recommendations, based on the established priorities, could then be made for '87-'88.

Prof. Ryan said the question was the matter of whether or not priority should come before the continued existence of the department purely as administrative decision and not by faculty determination, that is, through Council and Senate.

Dean Bertrand stated that he felt that the discussion of Classics as a department or programme was an issue that could not really be debated in a group such as Council. He felt the issue could best



be discussed between the Dean, possibly the Vice-Deans, and the members of that department. He said the decision was not strictly an administrative one and that if a solution could not be reached at this level, the issue would go to Senate for final determination.

Prof. Pallen said that he resented the view that the motion proposed by Steering Committee was a "cop-out". He did not think it the business of Council to be concerned with personnel matters unless there was direct evidence that decisions were being taken with the intent of jeopardizing a programme or its academic standards. He thought that Steering Committee's proposal, backed with an expression of concern on the part of Council that Classics has a particular problem, could go forward to Senate along with a request that Senate look at the issue in light of relevant articles of the Collective Agreement.

Prof. Arbuckle-Maag said that Senate could likely debate the issue, if it were formally brought before that body, only in '86-'87. She said that Senate was only supposed to debate the viability of the programme or department, viability being the number of students attracted to the programme. Thus, the issue of whether or not Classics was to be taught was not a concern of the Collective Agreement but rather an educational concern, and one on which both Council and Senate would likely wish to comment. She felt that the fundamental and broad-reaching principle to be debated would likely affect other departments besides Classics, given the present financial situation. She also noted that a Chairperson could oppose an early retirement if the department could not manage without a replacement.

Prof. Waters suggested that either Prof. Brown withdraw his motion or that Council defeat it and consider the following motion which would not necessarily be forwarded to Senate but which would be part of the Council documentation: "That this Council feels that the number of FT faculty teaching in Classics in 1986-88 should be made adequate for the student enrolments in Classics, and the needs of the programmes in the Classics Department."

Prof. Brown felt that this suggested motion would not lead anywhere. He assured Council that the department had overwhelming documentation from Classicists in Canada and the U.S. which pointed out that a move to dissolve a Classics department in favour of a Classics programme was a move in the wrong direction which displayed ignorance of the current state of Classical Studies in North America.

Prof. Ryan stated that one point to be made was that the Collective Agreement protected existing departments so that very clear evidence would have to be presented before a decision was taken that the department should be abolished. He said it was not a question of the Dean's priorities but rather one of departmental rights.

Dean Bertrand felt that this was one possible interpretation while another was to see Article 44 as protecting the jobs of people. If, for example, people were to lose jobs because of the dissolution of

a department, then Senate would debate the issue. He felt that the two interpretations would require a work-through, possible even to arbitration, to decide which of the two was correct.

It was decided to vote by secret ballot on the motion of Prof. Brown. It was noted that the original reference to "Tenure-track" was to be replaced by "Full-time". (ASFC 86-4-D5)

"Be it resolved that this Council will regard a failure to replace a retiring member of Classics with a full-time appointment as a move towards the dissolution of the Classics Department which is, to quote Dean Bertrand, according to the minutes approved, an academic matter, and as such would come before Faculty Council and a procedure which contravenes with this academic body."

Vote: Defeated

86-4-17 It was decided to vote on the motion of Steering Committee (ASFC 86-4-D6):

"The Arts and Science Faculty Council recognizes the procedures as outlined in articles 44.02 and 44.03 of the Collective Agreement and recommends that the Department of Classics follows the procedures stipulated therein."

Vote: Carried

11. Request to change the name of the Centre for Co-operative Education (ASFC 86-4-D7)

86-4-18 It was moved and seconded (Trudel/Pallen) that Council recommend to Senate that the names Centre for Co-operative Education and Director revert to Institute instead of Centre and Principal instead of Director since the reputation of the unit was made over the 1982-85 period using these terms.

Vote: Carried

12. Library Loans - regulations on the maximum number of books allowed

Prof. Broes explained that he would table this item and bring it before council at a later meeting.

13. Other Business

None.

14. Next Meeting

Wednesday, May 28, 1986, 9:30 a.m. in AD-131.

15. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.